



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/384,422

08/27/1999

PETER PAUL CAMILLE DE SCHRIJVER

Q55464

7818

7590

05/27/2005

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W  
WASHINGTON, DC 200373202

EXAMINER

HOANG, THAI D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2667

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/384,422

Applicant(s)

DE SCHRIJVER ET AL.

Examiner

Thai D. Hoang

Art Unit

2667

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7, 9-14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 3, 5-7, 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Chuah et al., US patent No. 6,519,254 B1, hereafter referred to as Chuah.

Regarding claims 3 and 7, Chuah discloses a method and system called Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) based tunnel protocol providing integrated services. Chuah discloses that the system comprises a sender (user terminal) coupled to an Internet Service Provider (ISP) 15 (hereinafter referred to as tunnel source point-TSP). The sender sends data to a second network that is connected with another Internet Service Provider 25 (hereinafter referred to as tunnel destination point-TDP) by a T1/E1 link 21. Chuah teaches the sender sends RSVP PATH message (request

message) to the TSP. Attached to the RSVP PATH message are the Sender TSpec object and the ADSPEC object, wherein the Sender TSpec object specifies the flow characteristics the sender is capable of sending; figs. 2-5; col. 1, lines 29-30; col. 3, lines 4-8; col. 4, lines 60-62 (data sending means (DSM), adapted to send said data towards said DRE; service level requesting means for generating an Internet Protocol Control Protocol (IPCP) message, for sending to said DRE, requesting a service level for communicating said data of said DTE over said second communications network). Furthermore, Chuah discloses the TDP determines the appropriate RSVP tunnel for this end-to-end RSVP session (see algorithm col. 6-11), if admitted (step 230 of FIG. 5) forms a TUNNEL\_BINDING object for notifying the TSP of the session to tunnel binding. The TDP encapsulates the end to end RSVP RESV and send it to the TSP. In response to the received TUNNEL\_BINDING object, the TSP uses the tunnel assigned by the TDP for the end-to-end RSVP session. The TSP forwards the remaining portion, which includes a FlowSpec Object (fig. 9, col. 5, lines 26-28), of the RSVP RESV message to the sender, wherein the FlowSpec Object comprises data flow information; figs. 2-5 and 9; col. 5, lines 5-18 (service level proposal receiving means: adapted to receive from said DRE an IPCP message indicating a proposed service level that said DRE can provide for communicating said data of said DTE over said second communications network, and notifying said DSM of said service level proposal). Furthermore, Chuah discloses the TDP receives RSVP PATH message of the TSP over the Internet 60 and transmits the message to the receiver network, figs. 3-4, col. 4, line 63-col. 5, line 1 (wherein said DRE receives said data of the DTE over said first communications

Art Unit: 2667

network and transmits said received data of the DTE in said second communications network).

Regarding claims 5-6, 9-12, the TDP 25 disclosed by Chuah inherently comprise a data receiving means for receiving incoming data from Internet 50 (data receiving means (DRM), adapted to receive said data from said DTE). Chuah discloses that the TDP receives RSVP PATH message (request message) from TSP (fig. 4), wherein the RSVP PATH message includes Sender Tspec object comprising characteristics average bit rate ( $r_i$ ), peak bit rate ( $p_i$ ), time delay ( $d_i$ ) for communicating with another end system; col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 23; col. 6, line 15-18 (service level request reception means for receiving an Internet Protocol Control Protocol (IPCP) message, from said DTE, indicating a requested service level for said communicating of said data of said DTE over said second communications network). Furthermore, Chuah teaches that the TDP calculates and determines service level for TSP based on requested service level received from TSP and RSVP RESV message. The TDP, in accordance with the invention, determines the appropriate RSVP tunnel for this end-to-end RSVP session by executing a receiver-driven tunnel assignment/admission control procedure (step 225 of FIG. 5) and, if admitted (step 230 of FIG. 5) forms a TUNNEL\_BINDING object for notifying the TSP of the session to tunnel binding. The TDP then encapsulates the end-to-end RSVP RESV message (along with the attached TUNNEL\_BINDING object) and sends it to the TSP (step 240 of FIG. 5); figs. 2-5; col. 5, lines 6-15 and 55-60; col. 12, line 64-col. 13 line 6 (service level negotiating and proposing means, for determining a service level that said DRE can provide for communicating said data of said DTE with

Art Unit: 2667

said second communications network, based on at least one predetermined criterion and on said requested service level, and formulating, as a service level proposal, an IPCP message indicating said determined service level; and service level proposal sending means, coupled with said service level negotiating and proposing means, for sending said IPCP message as said service level proposal.)

Regarding claim 13, the sender in the system disclosed by Chuah is a user terminal, and the TDP is an edge element of the network, figs.3-4.

Regarding claim 14, Chuah discloses the TDP is an Internet Service Provider, therefore, it is an access server provider, and the network connects with the Internet Service Provider is an Internet network, figs.3-4.

Regarding claim 16, the sender in the Chuah's system creates data for transmission and inherently comprises generating means for generating data for transmission.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuah et al., US patent No. 6,519,254 B1, hereafter referred to as Chuah.

Regarding claim 4, Chuah teaches that the system performs functions as recites in claims 4 and 8; col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 20 and col. 12, line 50-col. 13, line 11.

Chuah does not explicitly disclose a structure of the system to perform those functions. However, in order to perform the functions, the system disclosed by Chuah must have a plurality of elements, which are interconnected to implement the functions of the system.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 8 is allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Chuah et al., US patent No. 6,519,254 B1, discloses a method and system called Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) based tunnel protocol providing integrated services. Chuah does not teach or fairly suggest the following features:

A software module for running on a processing system for inclusion in a data transmitting element (DTE), for sending data, over a link through a first communications network, towards a data receiving element (DRE) for communication of said data over a second communications network, said software module comprising:

a data sending sub-module, adapted to send said data towards said DRE;

a service level requesting sub-module, for generating an Internet Protocol Control Protocol (IPCP) message, for sending to said DRE, requesting a service level

Art Unit: 2667

for communicating said data of said DTE over said second communications network;  
and

a service level proposal receiving sub-module:

adapted to receive from said DRE an IPCP message indicating a  
proposed service level that said DRE can provide for communicating said data of  
said DTE over said second communications network, and  
notifying said data sending sub-module of said received service level proposal;

a service level proposal renegotiating sub-module for checking whether  
the received service level proposal is satisfactory and for instructing said service  
level requesting sub-module to generate another service level request in an IPCP  
message with a different proposed service level, when the received service level  
proposal is found unsatisfactory.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later  
than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably  
accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on  
Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
examiner should be directed to Thai D. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 272-  
3184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00am-18:30pm.




Art Unit: 2667

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thai Hoang

  
CHI PHAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 5/25/05